



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*[Handwritten signature]*

Applicant(s): Ramana V. Gollamudi

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING DISTRIBUTED  
COMMUNICATION ROUTING

App. No.: 09/352,563

Filed: 07/13/1999

Examiner: Emdadi, Kamran

Group Art Unit: 2664

Atty. Dkt. No. 1400.4100210

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RECEIVED**

SEP 22 2003

Technology Center 2600

**RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office action of 04/10/2003, Applicant submits the following:

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12, 15-28, and 31-34. The Examiner has objected to claims 13, 14, 29, and 30. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-34.

The Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on the Pitcher and Callon references. However, the Examiner states that the same claims are rejected based on a newly applied reference.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7, 15, 17-19, 23, 31, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Civanlar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,963). Applicant respectfully disagrees, as set forth in detail below. While the Examiner states that the routing engine 107 and the routing database 104 provide information to the forwarding engine 105 which is implied to be the device that transmits and receives to other router ports and external to the router, citing col. 3, lines 28-30, Applicant submits that Civanlar et al. actually teaches away from such operation. Immediately following the cited portion, in col. 3, lines 30-33, Civanlar et al. state, "Each intelligent router port 103